STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD DIVISION OF WATER QUALITY P.O. BOX 100 SACRAMENTO, CA 95812-0100

Environmental Checklist

I. Ba	ackground			
	Project Title:			
	Contact Person:			
	Project Description:			
II. Eı	nvironmental Impacts			
	nvironmental factors challist on the following pa	below could be potentially aff more details.	ected by	y this project. See the
	Aesthetics	Agriculture and Forestry Resources		Air Quality
	Biological Resources	Cultural Resources		Geology/Soils
	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Hazards & Hazardous Materials □		Hydrology/Water Quality
	Land Use/Planning	Mineral Resources		Noise
	Population/Housing	Public Services		Recreation
	Transportation/Traffic	Utilities/Service Systems		Mandatory Findings of Significance

Iss	ues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1.	AESTHETICS. Would the project:				
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				
b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				
c)	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?				
d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				
(St	art discussion here.)				
2.	AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST RESOURCES. In determinare significant environmental impacts, lead agencies may refer that and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Eto use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determinational to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determination timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regard including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Protocols Would the project:	to the Califo Department of the commining what agencies in ding the statest Legacy 2.	ornia Agriculto of conservation mether impacts may refer to in- te's inventory Assessment pro-	ural Land Even as an option to forest restormation conforest languages; and forest; and forest; and forest forest;	aluation onal mode ources, mpiled by d, orest
a)	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping & Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural uses?				
b)	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				
c)	Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)) or timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526)?				
d)	Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				
e)	Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				
(St	art discussion here.)				
3.	AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria estal management or air pollution control district may be relied upon the project:				. Would
a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				
b)	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?				
c)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				

Issi	ues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d)	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?				
e)	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				
(St	art discussion here.)				
4.	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the DFG or USFWS?				
b)	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the DFG or USFWS?				
c)	Have a substantial adverse effect on federally-protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the federal Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, <i>etc.</i>) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption or other means?				
d)	Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				
e)	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				
f)	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				
(St	art discussion here.)				
5.	CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?				
b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in §15064.5?				
c)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				
d)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				
(St	art discussion here.)				
6.	GEOLOGY and SOILS. Would the project:				
a)	Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				

Issi	ues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated in the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines & Geology Special Publication 42.				
	ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?				
	iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				
	iv) Landslides?				
b)	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				
c)	Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?				
d)	Be located on expansive soils, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?				
e)	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternate wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?				
(St	art discussion here.)				
7. a)	GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS Would the project: Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?				
b)	Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?				
(St	art discussion here.)				
8.	HAZARDS and HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the projection	ect:			
a)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				
b)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				
c)	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within ¼ mile of an existing or proposed school?				
d)	Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or to the environment?				
e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or a public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				

Iss	ues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				
g)	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				
h)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				
(St	art discussion here.)				
9.	HYDROLOGY and WATER QUALITY. Would the project:				
a)	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				
b)	Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (<i>e.g.</i> , the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				
c)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation onor off-site?				
d)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?				
e)	Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				
f)	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				
g)	Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				
h)	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				
i)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				
j)	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				
(St	art discussion here.)				
10.	LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
a)	Physically divide an established community?				

Issi	ues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b)	Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				
c)	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				
(St	art discussion here.)				
11.	MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a)	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the State?				
b)	Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?				
(St	art discussion here.)				
12.	NOISE. Would the project result in:				
a)	Exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?				
b)	Exposure of persons to, or generation of, excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?				
c)	A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				
d)	A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				
e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing in or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				
f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing in or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				
(St	art discussion here.)				
13.	POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:				
a)	Induce substantial population growth in an area either directly (<i>e.g.</i> , by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (<i>e.g.</i> , through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				
b)	Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				
c)	Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				
(St	art discussion here.)				

Potentially Signification Mitigates Impact Incorp

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

14.	PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in substantial adv provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service rabjectives for any of the public services:	e construct	tion of which	could cause	significant
a)	Fire protection?				
b)	Police protection?				
c)	Schools?				
d)	Parks?				
e)	Other public facilities?				
(St	art discussion here.)				
15.	RECREATION. Would the project:				
a)	Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				
b)	Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				
(St	art discussion here.)				
16.	TRANSPORTATION / TRAFFIC. Would the project:				
a)	Exceed the capacity of the existing circulation system, based on an applicable measure of effectiveness (as designated in a general plan policy, ordinance, etc.), taking into account all relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?				
b)	Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				
c)	Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				
d)	Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				
e)	Result in inadequate emergency access?				
f)	Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				
(St	art discussion here.)				

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):

Issı	ues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
17.	UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:				
a)	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				
b)	Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts?				
c)	Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts?				
d)	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				
e)	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				
f)	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				
g)	Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				
(St	art discussion here.)				
18.	MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.				
a)	Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				
b)	Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)				
c)	Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				
(St	art discussion here.)				
Pre	pared By:				
•	our Name) Date				

Reviewed by:		
	Date	
	Date	(Form updated 7/28/09)

Authority: Public Resources Code Sections 21083, 21084, 21084.1, and 21087.

Reference: Public Resources Code Sections 21080(c), 21080.1, 21080.3, 21082.1, 21083, 21083.1 through 21083.3, 21083.6 through 21083.9, 21084.1, 21093, 21094, 21151; *Sundstrom v. County of Mendocino*, 202 Cal. App. 3d 296 (1988); *Leonoff v. Monterey Board of Supervisors*, 222 Cal. App. 3d 1337 (1990).

Information Sources: